

REMARKS

I. Introduction

Claims 14, 16 to 18, and 20 to 31 are pending and being considered in the present application. Claims 14, 20, 21, 25, and 26 have been amended. Claims 27 to 31 have been added. No new matter has been added. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the presently pending claims are allowable, and reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

II. Rejection of Claims 14, 16 to 18, 20, and 26 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 14, 16 to 18, 20, and 26, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as assertedly unpatentable over the combination of Japanese Patent Application Publication No. 2001-119451 (“Andreas”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,815,072 (“Yamanaka”).

Claim 14, as herein amended without prejudice, recites, *inter alia*, “at least one service uses at least one output medium, including **at least one video output medium** that includes at least two display adaptations of one service, while in an active state; . . . and **performing a speed-dependent adaptation of the at least one visual video output medium, where the display and the adapted display provide information about an active state of a service**.” Nothing in any of the cited references disclose or suggest this feature. Even if the devices (e.g., cell phone) discussed in Andreas may possibly be modified to be integrated with visual displays, nowhere is an adaptation of a video output medium disclosed. Indeed, Andreas does explicitly refer to any visual display at all.

Moreover, even if Andreas would disclose a video output medium, Andreas merely refers generally to disabling a service, such as a cell phone, but the **disabling** of the service does not disclose or suggest “performing a speed-dependent **adaptation** of the at least one visual video output medium, **where the display and the adapted display provide information about an active state of a service**.”

Moreover, since Andreas does not explicitly disclose any visual displays, Yamanaka is asserted as disclosing this feature. Yamanaka may generally disclose a “vehicle display device such as a speed meter including indicators, many segments illuminated in two or more colors by plural LEDs and an indicator control circuit,” where the color is speed-dependent. However, this configuration amounts to no more than a pre-set group of indicator lights, capable of displaying only one color at a time. This does not disclose a “video output medium,” and therefore does not disclose the features of claim 14.

In this regard, it is noted that “speed-dependent” functions in the cited prior art amount to (1) disabling a service and (2) adjusting a single color for an LED set. Both functions are one-dimensional. None of the cited references disclose or suggest modification of an at least two-dimensional display, and certainly not, more specifically, modification of a video display. As such, it is clear that the simple speed-dependent functions of the prior art do not render obvious a speed-dependent adaptation of a **video** output medium.

For at least this reason, the combination of Andreas and Yamanaka does not disclose or suggest all of the features of claim 14, so that the combination of Andreas and Yamanaka does not render unpatentable claim 14 or any of its dependent claims, e.g., claims 16 to 18 and 20.

As further regards claim 17, the claim provides that “at least **one service** uses **at least two input mediums**, the method further comprising: performing a speed-dependent selection from among the **at least two input mediums** for an operator control of the at least one service.” It is asserted that “two input mediums” of “one service” is disclosed in Andreas by “receiving phone call or operating panel for the car radio.” Though these may be “two input mediums,” they are clearly an input medium for two different services (e.g., the phone and the radio), and do not disclose *one service* that uses at least *two input mediums*. For this additional reason, the combination of Andreas and Yamanaka does not disclose or suggest all of the features of claim 17, so that the combination of Andreas and Yamanaka does not render unpatentable claim 17 for this additional reason.

Claim 26 includes subject matter analogous to that of claim 14, so that the combination of Andreas and Yamanaka does not render claim 26 unpatentable for at least essentially the same reasons as claim 14.

Withdrawal of this obviousness rejection of claims 14, 16 to 18, 20, 26 is therefore respectfully requested.

III. Rejection of Claim 21 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andreas in view of Yamanaka, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,714,860 (“Wawra”).

Claim 21 depends from claim 14 and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 14 since Wawra does not, and is not asserted to, cure the deficiencies of Andreas in view of Yamanaka noted above with regard to claim 14.

Withdrawal of this obviousness rejection of claim 21 is therefore respectfully requested.

IV. Rejection of Claim 22 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andreas in view of Yamanaka, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 7,126,583 (“Breed”).

Claim 22 depends from claim 14 and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 14 since Breed does not, and is not asserted to, cure the deficiencies of Andreas in view of Yamanaka noted above with regard to claim 14.

Withdrawal of this obviousness rejection of claim 22 is therefore respectfully requested.

V. Rejection of Claim 23 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andreas in view of Yamanaka, and in further view of Japanese Patent Application Publication No. 60-61923 (“Toshio”).

Claim 23 depends from claim 14 and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 14, since Toshio does not, and is not asserted to, cure the deficiencies of Andreas in view of Yamanaka noted above with regard to claim 14.

Withdrawal of this obviousness rejection of claim 23 is therefore respectfully requested.

VI. Rejection of Claim 24 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andreas in view of Yamanaka, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,973,333 (“O’Neil”).

Claim 24 depends from claim 14 and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 14 since O’Neil does not, and is not asserted to, cure the deficiencies of Andreas in view of Yamanaka noted above with regard to claim 14.

Withdrawal of this obviousness rejection of claim 24 is therefore respectfully requested.

VII. Rejection of Claim 25 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andreas in view of Yamanaka, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,667,726 (“Damiani”).

Claim 25 includes subject matter analogous to that of claim 14 and is therefore allowable for at least essentially the same reasons as claim 14 since Damiani does not cure, and is not cited to cure, the deficiencies of Andreas in view of Yamanaka noted above with regard to claim 14.

Withdrawal of this obviousness rejection of claim 25 is therefore respectfully requested.

VIII. New Claims 27 to 31

Claims 27 to 31 have been added herein. Claims 27 to 31 do not add new matter and are supported by the application, including Specification, as originally filed. Claims 27 to 31 depend from claim 14 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 14.

IX. Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are in condition for allowance. Prompt reconsideration and allowance of the present application are therefore earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 11, 2009

By: /Aaron Grunberger/
Aaron Grunberger, Reg. No. 59,210 for
Gerard A. Messina (Reg. No. 35,952)

KENYON & KENYON LLP
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200

CUSTOMER NO. 26646